

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present Application. Claims 1-2, 6, 8-9, 14, 16, and 19 have been amended herein. Claim 15 has been cancelled. Claims 1-14 and 16-23 are pending and are in condition for allowance.

Rejections based on 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 8-13 and 19-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 8-13 were said to be directed to one or more computer-readable media that may include a carrier wave (see Specification, [0029] and [0027], and therefore, the claims do not fall within any of the four categories of patentable subject matter set for the § 101.

Claims 8-13 have been amended to recite “computer-readable storage media”.

Claims 19-22 were said to be directed to a software system and would not be classified as a machine (nor process, product, article of manufacture). Therefore, the claims do not fall within any of the four categories of patentable subject matter set forth in § 101.

Claims 19-22 have been amended to recite “computer system having a processor and a memory”.

Rejections based on 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 8-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In particular, in claim 8, there is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation in the claim.

Claim 8 has been amended to remove the term “said” from “one or more receiving components.”

Rejections based on 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Conway, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0236777.

Regarding claim 1, Conway does not teach the elements of claim 1. Conway discloses that “[t]he Transaction Manager 140 transmits the formatted transactions to the host 150. A host is a unit that includes at least one processor and one or more instructions associated with a process performed by the host.” Conway does not disclose a transaction with substeps as required by Applicants’ claimed invention. Conway does not even disclose a transaction process. No language in Conway discloses this terminology. Conway only discloses a host which is a hardware device. This hardware device has a processor and software instructions associated with the process performed by the hardware device. Nothing in this language pertains to any transaction. Conway discloses how the host (hardware device) operates. Conway says nothing as to how the transaction is divided and processed as substeps. To be clearer, Applicants further limit claim 1 by adding the limitation “wherein a substep is a process to be performed in an execution of the transaction.” Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 1 be removed.

Even if the Examiner’s position is taken that the one or more instructions are substeps, Conway does not anticipate Applicants’ claimed invention. If the instructions are substeps, the Examiner has to show anticipation by showing that one or more indications related to the one or more instructions are communicated to display devices. So, when each instruction is executed, an indication has to be provided to the display devices. Conway does not and cannot teach an indication being provided to display devices for an executed instruction. Anticipation

cannot occur in an isolated vacuum. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 1 be removed.

Regarding claim 2, Conway does not teach “wherein said transaction includes two or more...”. Conway does not teach “call-routing instructions” nor “a LERG (Local Exchange Routing Guide”. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 2 be removed.

Regarding claim 3, Conway does not teach “receiving a transaction includes suspending user control until said transaction is received but prior to when said transaction is completed.” Conway teaches that an end-user sends a transaction to a host to be processed. The host processes the transaction and returns the result to the end-user via the Internet. See paragraph [0007] in Conway. In addition, Conway teaches that if the host is unavailable or cannot complete the transaction due to issues other than unavailability, the transaction is not completed. Manual or external intervention is needed as the Examiner states in the Office Action. See paragraph [0012] in Conway. Consequently, the disclosure in Conway does not anticipate Applicants’ claimed invention. First, there is nothing in Conway that discloses user control being suspended. The operative word is “suspending”. The Examiner must give patentable weight to the term. There is nothing in Conway that prevents the end-user from performing a second or third transaction after the first transaction is started. Secondly, any use of manual intervention is inconsistent with claim 1 which requires “without user interaction”. That requirement carries over to dependent claim 3. Conway discloses manual intervention which is contrary to Applicants’ claimed invention. Thirdly, Conway discloses a transaction that is complete. When the results are returned to the end-user, this is evidence of a completed transaction. Applicants’ claimed invention requires that user control only be suspended for a

time before the completion of the transaction, not with the completion and not after the completion. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 3 be removed.

For at least the above reasons, claim 4 depends from claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 4 be removed.

Regarding claim 5, Conway does not teach “communicating indications corresponding to disparate transactions to one or more display devices.” Conway discloses at paragraph [0037] “instant messages regarding the status and results of a transaction may be sent to the transaction agent or a wireless communication method may be used to update the transacting agent regarding the status and results of a transaction request. This language in Conway indicates that Applicants’ claimed invention is not anticipated. Applicants’ claimed invention requires communicating indications related to disparate transactions. Conway only discusses one transaction. Disparate transactions require separate distinct transactions. Conway does not disclose providing indications nor statuses pertaining to separate distinct transactions. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 5 be removed.

Regarding claim 6, Conway does not teach “two or more substeps”. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 6 be removed.

For at least the above reasons, claim 7 depends from claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 7 be removed.

Regarding claim 8, Conway does not teach the elements of claim 8. The same reasons traversing the rejection provided above for claim 1 are applicable here. Conway does not disclose a transaction with subprocesses as required by Applicants’ claimed invention. Conway does not even disclose a transaction process. Conway does not and cannot teach an

indication being provided to display devices for an executed instruction. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 8 be removed.

Regarding claim 9, Conway does not teach “wherein receiving a transaction includes receiving two or more...”. Conway does not teach “a table-modification request”, “a LERG (Local Exchange Routing Guide) update”, nor “a network-device-configuration change”. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 9 be removed.

For at least the above reasons, claims 10-12 depend from claim 8. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 10-12 be removed.

Regarding claim 13, Conway does not teach “sending indicators(s) associated with unique transactions simultaneously.” The reasoning provided above for claim 5 is applicable here. Applicants’ claimed invention requires communicating status indicators related to unique transactions. Conway only discusses one transaction where instant messages are sent for one transaction. Unique transactions equates to separate distinct transactions. Conway does not disclose providing indications nor statuses pertaining to separate distinct transactions. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 13 be removed.

Regarding claim 14, Conway does not teach “wherein said incoming transaction includes two or more...”. Conway does not teach “a call-routing modification associated with a telecommunication network”, “a table-modification request”, “a LERG (Local Exchange Routing Guide) update”, nor “a network-device-configuration change”. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 14 be removed.

Regarding claim 16, Conway does not teach the elements of claim 16. The same reasons traversing the rejection provided above for claim 3 are applicable here. There is nothing in Conway that discloses the request-receiving component retaining processing control while

receiving an incoming transaction. The Examiner stated in the Office Action for independent claim 14 that the request-receiving component is Host 150 in Conway. As such, Conway does not disclose the Host 150 retaining processor control. Host 150 cannot be used to anticipate request-receiving component in the independent claim 14 and totally ignored in dependent claim 16. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 16 be removed.

For at least the above reasons, claims 17-18 depend from claim 14. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 17-18 be removed.

Regarding claim 19, Conway does not teach “a first user-interface component”, “a transaction-processing system” and “a second user-interface component” bundled into one computer system. Conway does not disclose a computer system with all of the elements of claim 19. For example, a web page or web portal in Conway is not part of a computer system. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 19 be removed.

For at least the above reasons, claims 20-22 depend from claim 19. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 20-22 be removed.

Regarding claim 23, Conway does not teach “withholding processing control from said user” nor “returning processing control to said user”. The same reasons traversing the rejections provided above for claims 3 and 16 are applicable here. Conway teaches that an end-user sends a transaction to a host to be processed. The host processes the transaction and returns the result to the end-user via the Internet. See paragraph [0007] in Conway. There is nothing in Conway that discloses withholding processing control. There is nothing in Conway that prevents the end-user from performing a second or third transaction after the first transaction is started. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 23 be removed.

CONCLUSION

For at least the reasons stated above, claims 1-14 and 16-23 are now in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the pending rejections and allowance of the claims. If any issues remain that would prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned – 816-474-6550 or lsearcy@shb.com (such communication via email is herein expressly granted) – to resolve the same. It is believed that no fee is due, however, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any amount required to Deposit Account No. 21-0765.

Respectfully submitted,

/Leonard Searcy, II/

Leonard Searcy, II
Reg. No. 53,574

LS/bp
SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.
2555 Grand Blvd.
Kansas City, MO 64108-2613
816-474-6550